

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39650 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-84 Year-2024 Thana- SUPPI District- Sitamarhi

Ranjit Sahni @ Rajnit Sahni S/O Nawal Sahni R/O Village - Ward No.4,
Rohua @ Rohua Phulkahan Shyampur Bhataha, P.S.- Shyampur Bhataha,
Dist. - Sheohar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shantanu Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 30-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Suppi P.S. Case No. 84 of 2024, registered under Section 414 of
the Indian Penal Code and Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition
and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, there is recovery of
16.2 litres of *Nepali Saufi* liquor from the *dickey* of Glamour
motorcycle of which petitioner is registered owner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this
case being the owner of the seized motorcycle. Further
submission is that the vehicle in question was stolen on
19.03.2024 and the same was used by co-accused Rahul Patel.



Petitioner has no concern with the seized illicit liquor. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Petitioner has one criminal antecedent in which, he is on bail. Petitioner undertakes to cooperate in the investigation and trial.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that petitioner is registered owner of the seized motorcycle which was used for transportation of illicit liquor. There is no document available on record which shows that the said motorcycle was stolen. The *prima facie* is made out against the petitioner. Petitioner has one criminal antecedent. Therefore, petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and the fact that petitioner is registered owner of the vehicle from which, the illicit liquor has been recovered, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

utkarsh/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

